

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action¹, the Examiner objected to claims 1-14 for various informalities; rejected claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite; rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,990,906 to Hudson et al. ("Hudson") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,964 to Sano ("Sano"); rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of "HTML 4.01 Specification" ("HTML"); rejected claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,167,455 to Friedman et al. ("Friedman"); and rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,543,006 to Zundel et al. ("Zundel").

By this Reply, Applicants propose to amend claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 9-14, and to cancel claim 3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 9-14 would be pending in the application. Support for the claim amendments can be found, among other places, at paragraphs 20-34, 39, and 40 of the specification.

Claim Objections

Applicants respectfully submit that proposed amendments would address or otherwise render moot the various informalities noted by the Office Action at pages 2 and 3. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the objection to pending claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 9-14.

¹ The Final Office Action contains statements characterizing the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statements in the Office Action.

Rejections Under § 112, second paragraph

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed claim amendments would address or otherwise render moot the various antecedent basis issues noted by the Office Action at page 3. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Rejections Under § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1, 4, 9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view of Sano.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a computer program product comprising instructions operable to cause a data processing apparatus to perform a method, comprising, among other elements,

determining whether the **undo scope setting information** indicates the **data state** [corresponding to **data content** of the user interface element], the **view state** [corresponding to a **visual configuration** of the user interface element], or both . . . ;

when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate the data state, . . . **restoring only the data state** of the at least one user interface element to reflect the first state;

when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate the view state, . . . **restoring only the view state** of the at least one user interface element to reflect the first state; and

when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate both the data state and the view state, . . . **restoring**

both the data state and the view state for the at least one user interface element to the first state

(emphasis added). Hudson and Sano, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a combination comprising at least the above-referenced elements of amended independent claim 1.

Hudson discloses “[a]n Undo/Redo features for a graphical programming system which minimizes the required data storage.” Abstract. In Hudson, “the manner in which object backup is performed for a modification is slightly different depending on whether or not the object is a variable size object or a fixed size object.” Col. 13, ll. 22-24. Specifically, “for a fixed size object, . . . the method stores a copy of the original object as the previous object in the backup list.” Col. 13, ll. 40-42. In contrast, “when a variable size object is backed up, a new object is created, and that new object is placed in the foreground, and the original object goes into the background as the stored object for undo purposes.” Col. 13, ll. 57-61. Accordingly, “[t]he original fixed size object is the one that is actually modified and left in the program as the current or foreground object,” thus reducing the required amount of data storage for the undo operation. Col. 13, ll. 65-67.

Hudson, however, makes no determination as to “whether the **undo scope setting information** indicates the **data state** [corresponding to **data content** of the user interface element], the **view state** [corresponding to a **visual configuration** of the user interface element], or both . . .” (emphasis added), as recited by amended independent claim 1. Indeed, Hudson is completely silent with respect to the “scope” of an undo operation. That is, in performing the undo operation, Hudson makes no

distinction between a "**data state** corresponding to **data content**" of the user interface element and a "**view state** corresponding to a **visual configuration**" of the user interface element, as recited by amended independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Hudson cannot disclose or suggest "when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate the data state, . . . **restoring only the data state** of the at least one user interface element to reflect the first state," "when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate the view state, . . . **restoring only the view state** of the at least one user interface element to reflect the first state," and "when the undo scope setting information is determined to indicate both the data state and the view state, . . . **restoring both the data state and the view state** for the at least one user interface element to the first state" (emphasis added), as recited by amended independent claim 1.

Sano fails to remedy at least the above-noted deficiencies of Hudson. Sano discloses, "[a] CAD system for team-based design provides an undo function and a redo function for execution by each designer during team-based design." Specifically, "[w]hen a designer executes the undo function in the operator reference mode, the history information . . . is searched, only the last operation performed by the designer is canceled, and the operations by the other designers in the same team are not canceled. Furthermore, when a designer executes the redo function, an operation that was canceled by the designer executing the last undo function is redone and the operations by the other designers in the same team are not redone." Abstract. Sano, however, also fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-cited elements of amended independent claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, Hudson and Sano, even if combined as proposed in the Office Action, fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claim 1. Moreover, amended independent claims 9 and 14, though of different scope from amended independent claim 1, recite similar elements to those discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to independent claims 9 and 14 for at least similar reasons as set forth above with respect to independent claim 1. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to claims 4, 11, 12, and 13 at least due to their dependence from one of the independent claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4, 9, and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of HTML.

Claim 2 depends from amended independent claim 1, and therefore includes all the elements thereof. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to dependent claim 2 inasmuch as HTML fails to remedy at least the deficiencies of Hudson and Sano discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of Friedman.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from amended independent claim 1, and therefore include all the elements thereof. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to dependent claims 5 and 6 inasmuch as Friedman fails to remedy at least the deficiencies of Hudson and Sano discussed above in connection with independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Hudson in view Sano, and in further view of Zundel.

Claim 10 depends from amended independent claim 9, and therefore includes all the elements thereof. Accordingly, a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to dependent claim 10 inasmuch as Friedman fails to remedy at least the deficiencies of Hudson and Sano discussed above in connection with independent claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request entry of this Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, placing the pending claims in condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal, should the Examiner dispute the patentability of the pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would be useful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at 202.216.5118.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: January 12, 2010

By: 

James D. Stein
Reg. No. 63,782
202.216.5118 (direct)